



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,091	10/15/2001	Koskimies Oskari	017.40746X00	9332

22907 7590 02/15/2007
BANNER & WITCOFF
1001 G STREET N W
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

PATEL, NIRAV B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,091

Applicant(s)

OSKARI, KOSKIMIES

Examiner

Nirav Patel

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2005 (Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-94 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on December 14, 2005 has been entered. Claims 1-47 are cancelled by the applicant. Claims 48-94 are new added claims by the applicant.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 91, 92 and 93 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 91, 92 and 93 contain the semicolon (;) at the end of the claim rather than the period (.), which is treated as typographic error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 48, 50, 51 and 54-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al (US Patent No. 5,987,134) in view of Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,980,660) and in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450).

As per claim 48, Shin teaches:

a first electronic key device configured to generate an electronic ticket for providing a second electronic key device authorization to unlock an electronic lock device [Fig. 1,

Art Unit: 2135

col. 5 lines 12-19, 30-33], wherein the ticket is transmittable from the first electronic key device to the second key device [Fig. 1, col. 5 lines 17-20]

Shin teaches generating the access ticket from the public key [col. 7 lines 60-67].

Hind teaches the electronic ticket comprising a receiver public key corresponding to the second key device [Fig. 4, col. 7 lines 39-41].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hind with Shin, since one would have been motivated to provide efficient administration of secure devices within an enterprise and access control in the enterprise [Hind, col. 6 lines 13-19].

Shin teaches verification device for controlling an access to files, resources, etc. based on the result of the authentication [Fig. 4, 5].

Davis teaches:

the electronic lock device, wherein the electronic lock device is configured to receive the electronic ticket from the second key device and to authenticate the second key device using the receiver public key stored in the electronic ticket prior to disengaging one or more locking mechanisms of the lock device [Fig. 5, 6A-6C, col. 7 lines 17-34, col. 5 lines 24-33].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davis with Shin and Hind, since one would have been motivated to provide wireless authentication system for access control in various field [Davis, col. 1 lines 25-28].

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 50, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and Davis teaches said lock device is a virtual lock device in a form of a software module controlling access to digital resources [Fig. 1, 2, col. 4 lines 15-19, 41-61].

As per claim 51, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and Shin teaches said lock device stores public keys for a plurality of authorized key holders [Fig. 5 component 101].

As per claim 54, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and Davis teaches: wherein at least one of the first and second key devices comprises a portable wireless device carried by a user [col. 2 lines 42-43].

As per claim 55, the rejection of claim 53 is incorporated and Davis teaches: wherein at least one of the first and second electronic key devices comprises a wireless telephone [col. 3 lines 58-63].

As per claim 56, the rejection of claim 53 is incorporated and Davis teaches: wherein at least one of the first and second electronic key devices is wearable by the user [col. 2 lines 42-43].

As per claim 57, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and Davis teaches:

Art Unit: 2135

wherein at least one of the first and second key devices includes a power source, a processor, non-volatile memory and a transmitter/receiver unit [Fig. 4].

As per claim 58, the rejection of claim 57 is incorporated and Davis teaches:

wherein at least one of the first and second key devices further includes a user authentication device [Fig. 7A, col. 7 lines 63-67].

As per claim 59, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 48.

Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 48 above.

As per claim 60, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 50. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 50 above.

As per claim 61, the rejection of claim 60 is incorporated and Shin teaches:

wherein at least one of the one or more electronic tickets grants access to at least part of the said digital resources [Fig. 1, 3, col. 5 lines 21-33].

4. Claims 49,52,53, 65-67 and 74-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al (US Patent No. 5,987,134) in view of Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,980,660) in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) and in view of Scott et al (US Patent No. 6,484,260).

As per claim 49, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and Davis teaches said lock device and said key wirelessly connected [Fig. 1, col. 3 lines 65-67].

Hind teaches mobile communication/wireless communication using Bluetooth short range communication protocol [col. 1 lines 37-40].

Scott teaches the lock device and said key device wirelessly connect using short range communication protocol [Fig. 1, col. 9 lines 29-37].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scott with Shin, Hind and Davis, since one would have been motivated to provide secure access to a host facility [Scott, col. 1 lines 47-49].

As per claim 52, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and Scott discloses:

the first public key is stored in a plurality of lock devices for which entry is authorized for said key device [col. 6 lines 29-31 "access to one or more secure host facilities 4 only to registered persons", col. 7 lines 24-27].

As per claim 53, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and Scott discloses:

a different public key is stored in each lock device for which entry is authorized for said key device [col. 6 lines 30-31, col. 7 lines 24-34].

As per claim 65, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Scott teaches:

Art Unit: 2135

wherein the one or more electronic tickets are transmittable to one or more lock devices [col. 6 lines 29-31].

As per claim 66, the rejection of claim 65 is incorporated and Davis teaches said electronic lock device is a virtual lock device in a form of a software module controlling access to digital resources [Fig. 1, 2, col. 4 lines 15-19, 41-61].

As per claim 67, the rejection of claim 66 is incorporated and Shin teaches: wherein at least one of the one or more electronic tickets grants access to at least part of the said digital resources [Fig. 1, 3, col. 5 lines 21-33].

As per claim 74, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Scott teaches: wherein at least one of the first and second key devices includes a personal identification number [col. 2 lines 16-21].

As per claim 75, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Scott teaches: wherein at least one of the first key device, the second key device and said lock device includes authentication information in the form of coded information known to the user [col. 6 lines 54-61].

As per claim 76, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Scott teaches:

Art Unit: 2135

wherein at least one of the first key device, the second key device and said lock device includes authentication information in the form of a physical feature of the user [col. 6 lines 54-61].

As per claim 77, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and further Scott teaches:

said lock device stores a list of invalid key devices and denies authorization to any one of the key devices in the list of invalid key devices [col. 3 lines 5-19].

As per claim 78, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and further Scott teaches:

said lock device stores a use counter for n-use electronic tickets [col. 8 lines 11-12 "].

As per claim 79, the rejection of claim 159 is incorporated and further Scott teaches:

said lock device includes an identification number where the identification number is hierarchical [col. 5 lines 12-14].

5. Claims 62-64 and 68-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al (US Patent No. 5,987,134) in view of Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,980,660) in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) and in view of Rosen (US Patent No. 6,175,921).

As per claim 62, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Shin teaches the access ticket [Fig. 1].

Art Unit: 2135

Rosen teaches:

the one or more electronic tickets further comprise access limits [Fig. 2].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rosen with Shin, Hind and Davis, since one would have been motivated to provide access control in the enterprise [Hind, col. 6 lines 13-19].

As per claim 63, the rejection of claim 62 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein the access limits include time of day [Fig. 2].

As per claim 64, the rejection of claim 62 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein the access limits include authorization to generate further electronic tickets [Fig. 2].

As per claim 68, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Davis teaches key device [Fig. 1] such as cellular telephone [col. 3 line 63]. Hind teaches mobile device with display for indicating [col. 13 lines 16-18].

Rosen teaches: indicating the number of available electronic tickets [Fig. 2].

As per claim 69, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein the one or more electronic tickets include an expiration date [Fig. 2].

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 70, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein the one or more electronic tickets include additional information unrelated to the electronic lock and the first and second key devices [Fig. 2].

As per claim 71, the rejection of claim 70 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein said additional information contains user-related information [Fig. 2].

As per claim 72, the rejection of claim 59 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein the first key device stores additional information unrelated to the encryption key pair [Fig. 2].

As per claim 73, the rejection of claim 72 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein said additional information comprises a Social Security number [Fig. 2].

6. Claims 80-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al (US Patent No. 5,987,134) in view of Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,980,660) in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) and in view of Terao et al (US Patent No. 6,690,794).

As per claim 80, Shin teaches:

Art Unit: 2135

a first electronic key device configured to generate one or more electronic tickets, wherein a first of the one or more tickets is transmittable to a second key device, the second electronic key device configured to receive the first ticket from the first electronic key device [Fig. 1, col. 5 lines 12-19, 30-33, Fig. 1, col. 5 lines 17-20].

Shin teaches generating the access ticket from the public key [col. 7 lines 60-67].

Hind teaches the first ticket stores a public key corresponding to the second key device [Fig. 4, col. 7 lines 39-41].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hind with Shin, since one would have been motivated to provide efficient administration of secure devices within an enterprise and access control in the enterprise [Hind, col. 6 lines 13-19].

Shin teaches verification device for controlling an access to files, resources, etc. based on the result of the authentication [Fig. 4, 5].

Davis teaches:

the electronic lock device, wherein the electronic lock device is configured to receive the electronic ticket from the second key device and to authenticate the second key device using the public key stored in the electronic ticket prior to disengaging one or more locking mechanisms of the lock device [Fig. 5, 6A-6C, col. 7 lines 17-34, col. 5 lines 24-33].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davis with Shin and Hind, since one would have

Art Unit: 2135

been motivated to provide wireless authentication system for access control in various field [Davis, col. 1 lines 25-28].

Davis teaches a trusted authority (an electronic control device) for loading the key [Fig. 6c].

Terao teaches an electronic control device connectable to the first electronic key device for loading the private key and other data into the first key device [Fig. 2, 3].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Terao with Shin, Hind and Davis, since one would have been motivated to prevent unauthorized ticket use [Terao, col. 4 line 27].

As per claim 81, the rejection of claim 80 is incorporated and Davis teaches the electronic lock device is a virtual lock device for controlling access to digital resources [Fig. 1, 2, col. 4 lines 15-19, 41-61].

As per claim 82, the rejection of claim 80 is incorporated and Shin teaches:

wherein at least one of the first and second key devices is non-interactive with a user [Fig. 1].

As per claim 83, the rejection of claim 80 is incorporated and Terao teaches:

wherein the control device loads the first key device remotely and electronically [Fig. 2, 3].

As per claim 84, the rejection of claim 80 is incorporated and Terao teaches:

wherein the control device further loads data into at least one other key device [Fig. 2, 3].

7. Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al (US Patent No. 5,987,134) in view of Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,980,660) in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) in view of Terao et al (US Patent No. 6,690,794) and in view of Nielsen (US Patent No. 7,012,503).

As per claim 85, the rejection of claim 80 is incorporated and Nielsen teaches:

wherein confirmation data is input into the control device which forwards confirmation to the first key device [col. 18 lines 1-5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nielsen with Shin, Hind, Davis and Terao, since one would have been motivated to control access to a location [Nielsen, col.1 lines 11-12].

8. Claim 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,826,690) and in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450).

As per claim 86, Hind teaches:

receiving an authentication request from a receiving key device, wherein the authentication request comprises a key identifier of a grantor key device [Fig. 5A, 6, 7A];

Art Unit: 2135

transmitting a lock identifier and a first random signal to the receiving key device in response to the request [Fig. 5B, 7B]. Further, Hind teaches receiving a random number and a ticket (certificate), wherein the ticket comprises a public key corresponding to the receiving key device, and wherein the public key is used to authenticate the receiving key device [Fig. 5A, 7A].

Davis teaches:

receiving an encrypted random signal and ticket from the receiving key device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 17-29]; determining a second random signal by decrypting the encrypted random signal using the public key stored in the ticket; and disengaging a lock if the second random signal matches the first random signal [col. 7 lines 28-34, col. 6 lines 30-32].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davis with Hind, since one would have been motivated to provide wireless authentication system for access control in various field [Davis, col. 1 lines 25-28].

9. Claims 87-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,826,690) in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) and in view of Rosen (US Patent No. 6,175,921).

As per claim 87, the rejection of claim 86 is incorporated and Rosen teaches:

wherein the ticket defines access limits to opening said lock device. [Fig. 2].

Art Unit: 2135

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rosen with Shin and Hind, since one would have been motivated to provide an access control for various object/resources [Rosen, col. 4 lines 51-63].

As per claim 88, the rejection of claim 87 is incorporated and Rosen teaches: wherein said limits include number of day [Fig. 2].

As per claim 89, the rejection of claim 87 is incorporated and Rosen teaches: wherein the access limits include time of day [Fig. 2].

As per claim 90, the rejection of claim 87 is incorporated and Rosen teaches: said limits include authority to generate further tickets [Fig. 2].

10. Claim 91 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind et al (US Patent No. 6,826,690) in view of Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) in view of Rosen (US Patent No. 6,175,921) and in view of Shin et al (US Patent No. 5,987,134).

As per claim 91, the rejection of claim 87 is incorporated and Shin teaches: wherein the ticket is generated using an electronic control device [Fig. 1].

Art Unit: 2135

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shin with Hind, Davis, Rosen, since one would have been motivated to provide user's access right to resources.

11. Claim 92 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) in view of Terao (US Patent No. 7,000,110) in view of Nielsen (US Patent No. 7,012,503) and in view of Marsh (US Patent No. 7,124,938).

As per claim 92, Davis teaches:

establishing communications between the second key device and the electronic lock device [Fig. 6c]; transmitting the ticket from the second key device to the electronic lock device [Fig. 6c col. 7 lines 17-27]; verifying the ticket on the lock device by decrypting a random number using a first public key corresponding to the first key device, wherein the first public key is stored on the electronic lock device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 38-30]; transmitting a first random signal from the lock device to the second key device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 15-16]; encrypting the first random signal using a second private key corresponding to the second key device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 17-18]; transmitting the encrypted random signal from the second key device to the lock device [Fig. 6c]; determining a second random signal by decrypting the encrypted random signal using the second public key, wherein the second public key is extracted by the lock device from the ticket; and releasing a lock mechanism of the lock device if the

Art Unit: 2135

second random signal matches the first random signal [Fig. 6c, col. 28-34, col. 6 lines 30-32].

Davis teaches verifying the ticket (message) on the lock device by decrypting the random number and the random number stored in the ticket (message) [Fig. 6c]. Davis doesn't mention a checksum stored in the ticket.

However, Terao teaches a checksum stored in the ticket [Fig. 20, col. 2 lines 57-67, col. 3 lines 1-19].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Terao with Davis, since one would have been motivated to provide access-ticket based authentication and increased the efficiency [Terao, col. 2 lines 31-35].

Nielsen teaches: generating a transmittable ticket (e.g. access code) on a first key device, wherein the first key device is authorized to unlock the electronic lock device and transmitting the ticket to the second key device [Fig. 1a or 1b].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nielsen with Davis and Terao, since one would have been motivated to control access to a location, where access to the location is restricted by a lock mechanism [Nielsen, col.1 lines 11-12].

Marsh teaches:

the ticket comprises a second public key corresponding to the second key device and a first private key corresponding to the first key device [Fig. 270, 276].

Art Unit: 2135

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Marsh with Davis, Terao and Nielsen, since one would have been motivated to provide access control in various field [Davis, col. 1 lines 25-28].

12. Claim 93 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) and in view of Terao (US Patent No. 7,000,110).

As per claim 93, Davis teaches:

receiving a ticket from a grantor key device wherein the ticket stores a receiving public key corresponding to the receiving key device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 26-27], wherein the receiving public key is used to authenticate the receiving key device with the lock device prior to disengaging one or more locking mechanisms of the lock device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 30-34, col. 6 lines 30-32]; authenticating the ticket with the lock device using an encrypted checksum stored in the ticket, wherein the checksum is encrypted using a grantor private key corresponding to the grantor key device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 17-19]; receiving a random number from said lock device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 15-16]; and encrypting the random number with a receiving private key, wherein the receiving private key and the receiving public key are parts of an encryption key pair [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 17-19]; and sending the encrypted random number and said ticket to the lock device [Fig. 6c, col. 7 lines 26-27].

Art Unit: 2135

Davis teaches authenticating the ticket (message) with the lock device using encrypted the random number and the random number stored in the ticket (message) [Fig. 6c].

Davis doesn't mention a checksum stored in the ticket.

However, Terao teaches a checksum stored in the ticket [Fig. 20, col. 2 lines 57-67, col. 3 lines 1-19].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Terao with Davis, since one would have been motivated to provide access-ticket based authentication and increase the efficiency [Terao, col. 2 lines 31-35].

13. Claim 93 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (US Patent No. 6,088,450) and in view of Terao (US Patent No. 7,000,110) and in view of Swift et al (US Patent No. 7,113,994).

As per claim 94, the rejection of claim 93 is incorporated and Swift teaches:

authenticating the lock device using a link key stored on the ticket [Fig. 6, col. 7 lines 39-52].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Swift with Davis and Terao, since one would have been motivated to control services in the network [Swift, col. 1 lines 7-9].

Response to Amendment

14. Applicant has cancelled claims 1-47 and added new claims 48-94, which necessitated new ground of rejection. See rejection above.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (See form 892).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-

Art Unit: 2135

272-5936. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

NBP
2/9/07



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100